arXiv:1612.02737v1 [math.AT] 8 Dec 2016

A_∞-resolutions and the Golod property for monomial rings

Robin Frankhuizen

Abstract

Let $R = S/I$ be a monomial ring whose minimal free resolution F is rooted. We describe an A_∞-algebra structure on F. Using this structure, we show that R is Golod if and only if the product on $\mathrm{Tor}^S(R,k)$ vanishes. Furthermore, we give a necessary and sufficient combinatorial condition for R to be Golod.

1 Introduction

Let $S = k[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$ be the polynomial algebra over a field k in m variables and let $I = (m_1, \ldots, m_r)$ be an ideal generated by monomials. In that case, S/I is called a *monomial* ring. Given a monomial ring $R = S/I$, the *Poincaré series* of R is defined as

$$P(R) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \dim \mathrm{Tor}_j^R(k,k) t^j.$$

The ring R is called *Golod* if there is an equality of power series

$$P(R) = \frac{(1+t)^m}{1 - t(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \dim \mathrm{Tor}_j^S(R,k) t^j - 1)}.$$

The problem of when a monomial ring is Golod goes back to at least the 70s when Golod [8] showed that there always is an inequality

$$P(R) \leq \frac{(1+t)^m}{1 - t(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \dim \mathrm{Tor}_j^S(R,k) t^j - 1)}$$

and showed that equality holds if and only if all Massey products on the Koszul homology $\mathrm{Tor}^S(R,k)$ vanish. In general, it is hard to directly verify the vanishing of Massey products and so in practice the Golod property is still hard to determine. A significant amount of recent work in both algebra and topology has been dedicated to finding conditions for Golodness that are easier to verify. Using results from [10], it has been claimed in [5] that R is Golod if and only if the product on $\mathrm{Tor}^S(R,k)$ vanishes. However, recently a counterexample to this claim was found in [12].

In this paper we develop a new approach to the Golodness problem using A_∞-algebras. An A_∞-algebra is similar to a differential graded algebra (dga), except that associativity only holds up coherent homotopy. By contrast with dgas, every resolution admits the structure of an A_∞-algebra [6] hence in particular the minimal free resolution does. The first main result of this paper characterizes Golodness in terms of this A_∞-structure.

Theorem A. Let $R = S/I$ be a monomial ring with minimal free resolution F. Let μ_n be an A_∞-structure on F. Then R is Golod if and only if μ_n is minimal for all $n \geq 1$.

As an immediate application, we show in Corollary 4.9 that if the minimal free resolution of R admits a dga structure, then R is Golod if and only if the product on $\mathrm{Tor}^S(R,k)$ vanishes. This in turn allows us to give in Theorem 4.11 a necessary and sufficient combinatorial condition for R being Golod for those rings R which have minimal Taylor resolution. However, as Lemma 4.10 shows, the Taylor resolution is rarely minimal. Consequently, we broaden our attention to monomial rings R whose minimal free resolution F is rooted in the sense of [22]. Rooted resolutions include both the Taylor and Lyubeznik resolution. Given such a monomial ring with rooting map π, the Merkulov construction [20] yields an A_∞-structure on F. The benefit of this construction is that the higher multiplications μ_n can be described in terms of the rooting map π. We say that an ideal $I = (m_1, \ldots, m_r)$ with rooting map π is *π-gcd* if $\pi(m_i, m_j) \neq m_i, m_j$ whenever $\gcd(m_i, m_j) = 1$. We use the A_∞-algebra structure on F to characterize Golodness both in terms of the product on $\mathrm{Tor}^S(R,k)$ and in terms of the π-gcd condition. More precisely, the main result is the following.

Theorem B. Let R be a rooted ring with rooting map π. Then the following are equivalent.

1. The ring R is Golod.
2. The product on $\mathrm{Tor}^S(R,k)$ vanishes.
3. The ring R is π-gcd.

In particular, the main result from [5] does hold when restricted to monomial rings with rooted minimal free resolution. As an application, we specialize to rings with minimal Lyubeznik resolution. In this case, the π-gcd condition reduces to the following. Let $I = (m_1, \ldots, m_r)$ be a Lyubeznik ideal with respect to the ordering

$$m_1 \prec m_2 \prec \cdots \prec m_r.$$

Then I is said to satisfy the *gcd condition* if for all generators m_i and m_j with $\gcd(m_i, m_j) = 1$ there exists a $m_k \prec m_i, m_j$ such that m_k divides $\mathrm{lcm}(m_i, m_j)$. Therefore, we have the following consequence of Theorem B.

Theorem C. Let R be a Lyubeznik ring. Then the following are equivalent.

1. The ring R is Golod.
2. The product on $\mathrm{Tor}^S(R,k)$ vanishes.
3. The ring R is gcd.

2 Simplicial resolutions

Let $S = k[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$ be the polynomial algebra in m variables over a field k and let I be the ideal minimally generated by monomials $m_1, \ldots, m_r$. The quotient S/I is called a *monomial ring*. Recall that a *free resolution* over S of S/I is an exact sequence

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{d} F_n \xrightarrow{d} F_{n-1} \xrightarrow{d} \cdots \xrightarrow{d} F_1 \xrightarrow{d} F_0 \xrightarrow{d} S/I \longrightarrow 0$$

where each F_i is a free S-module. An explicit free resolution is given by the *Taylor resolution* T [25] which is constructed as follows. Let E denote the exterior algebra on generators $u_1, \ldots, u_r$. The resolution T has underlying module $S \otimes_k E$. If $J = \{j_1, \ldots, j_k\} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, r\}$, then we write $u_J = u_{j_1} \cdots u_{j_k}$. Furthermore, we put $m_J = \operatorname{lcm}(m_{j_1}, \ldots, m_{j_k})$. We will also write $J^i = \{j_1, \ldots, \widehat{j_i}, \ldots, j_k\}$. The differential d of T is give by

$$d(u_J) = \sum_{i=1}^{|J|} (-1)^{i+1} \frac{m_J}{m_{J^i}} u_{J^i}.$$

The Taylor resolution admits a multiplication defined by

$$u_I \cdot u_J = \begin{cases} \operatorname{sgn}(I,J) \frac{m_I m_J}{m_{I \cup J}} u_{I \cup J} & \text{if } I \cap J = \emptyset \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\operatorname{sgn}(I, J)$ is the sign of the perumution making $I \cup J$ into an increasing sequence. This multiplication induces a differential graded algebra (dga) structure on T. The k-vector spaces $\operatorname{Tor}_n^S(S/I, k)$ are defined to be

$$\operatorname{Tor}_n^S(S/I, k) = H_n(T \otimes_S k).$$

The *Tor-algebra* $\operatorname{Tor}^S(S/I, k)$ of S/I is

$$\operatorname{Tor}^S(S/I, k) = \bigoplus_n \operatorname{Tor}_n^S(S/I, k)$$

where the multiplication is induced by the multiplication on T

The following method of constructing free resolutions of monomial rings is due to Bayer, Peeva and Sturmfels [4]. Our exposition will follow that of Mermin [21]. Let $\{m_1, \ldots, m_r\}$ be a set of monomials. Fix some total order $\prec$ on $\{m_1, \ldots, m_r\}$. After relabelling we may assume that $m_1 \prec m_2 \prec \cdots \prec m_r$. Let Δ be a simplicial complex on the vertex set $\{1, \ldots, r\}$. By abuse of notation, we will say Δ is a simplicial complex on vertex set $\{m_1, \ldots, m_r\}$.
Assign a multidegree m_J to each simplex $J \in \Delta$ by defining

$$m_J = \operatorname{lcm}\{m_j \mid j \in J\}.$$

Define a chain complex F_Δ associated to Δ as follows. Let F_n be the free S-module on generators u_J with $|J| = n$. For $J = \{j_1, \ldots, j_n\}$, put $J^i = \{j_1, \ldots, \widehat{j_i}, \ldots, j_n\}$. The differential $d \colon F_n \to F_{n-1}$ is defined by

$$d(u_J) = \sum_{i=1}^{|J|} (-1)^{i+1} \frac{m_J}{m_{J^i}} u_{J^i}$$

where $J \in \Delta$.

Example 2.1. Let Δ^r be the full r-simplex. Then F_{Δ^r} is the Taylor resolution of $R = S/I$. This also justifies the use of the same notation for both.

In general, F_Δ need not be a resolution of S/I. However, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.2 ([4], Lemma 2.2)**.** Let Δ be a simplicial complex on vertex set $\{m_1, \ldots, m_r\}$ and define, for a multidegree μ, a subcomplex

$$\Delta_\mu = \{J \in \Delta \mid m_J \text{ divides } \mu\}.$$

Then F_Δ is a resolution of R if and only if Δ_μ is either acyclic or empty for all multidegrees μ.

A resolution F is called a *simplicial resolution* if $F = F_\Delta$ for some simplicial complex Δ.

Remark 2.3. Note that if $\Delta' \subseteq \Delta$, then $F_{\Delta'}$ is a subcomplex of F_Δ. In particular, since each simplicial complex Δ is included in the full simplex on its vertex set, each simplicial resolution of S/I is a subcomplex of the Taylor resolution of S/I.

In the rest of the paper we will restrict our attention to the following special type of simplicial resolution which is due to Novik [22]. Given an monomial ideal $I = (m_1, \ldots, m_r)$ we define the *lcm-lattice* $L(I)$ to be the set of all $\operatorname{lcm}(m_{i_1}, \ldots, m_{i_k})$ where $1 \leq i_1 \leq \cdots \leq i_k \leq r$ and $k = 1, \ldots, r$. The set $L = L(I)$ admits a partial order given by divisibility. Then L forms a lattice under $a \vee b = \operatorname{lcm}(a, b)$ and $a \wedge b = \gcd(a, b)$. The lattice L has minimal element $\hat{0} = 1$ and maximal element $\hat{1} = \operatorname{lcm}(m_1, \ldots, m_r)$.

Definition 2.4. A *rooting map* on L is a map

$$\pi \colon L \setminus \{\hat{0}\} \to \{m_1, \ldots, m_r\}$$

such that

1. for every $m \in L$, $\pi(m)$ divides m
2. $\pi(m) = \pi(n)$ whenever $pi(m)$ divides n and n divides m.

Now, let π be a rooting map and let $A \subseteq \{m_1, \ldots, m_r\}$ be non-empty. Define $\pi(A) = \pi(\operatorname{lcm}(A))$. A set A is *unbroken* if $\pi(A) \in A$ and A is *rooted* if every non-empty $B \subseteq A$ is unbroken. Let $RC(L, \pi)$ denote the set of all rooted sets with respect to L and π. Then $RC(L, \pi)$ is easily seen to be a simplicial complex on vertex set $\{m_1, \ldots, m_r\}$ and we have the following result.

Theorem 2.5 ([22], Theorem 1)**.** Let $I = (m_1, \ldots, m_r)$ be a monomial ideal and let L denote its lcm-lattice. Suppose that π is a rooting map on L. Then the chain complex $F_{RC(L,\pi)}$ associated to the simplicial complex $RC(L, \pi)$ is a free resolution of I.

An important special case of this construction is the Lyubeznik resolution which will be defined next.

Definition 2.6. Let $I = (m_1, \ldots, m_r)$ be a monomial ideal and pick some total order $\prec$ on the m_i. After relabelling we may assume that $m_1 \prec m_2 \prec \cdots \prec m_r$. Define

$$\pi(S) = \min\nolimits_{\prec}\{m_i \mid m_i \text{ divides } \operatorname{lcm}(S)\}.$$

Then π is easily seen to be a rooting map. The resolution associated $RC(L, \pi)$ is called the *Lyubeznik resolution*.

In this paper we will only consider resolutions F that are as small as possible in the sense that each F_n has the minimal number of generators. More precisely, we have the following definition.

Definition 2.7. Let $S = k[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$ and let S/I be a monomial ring. A free resolution $F \to S/I$ is said to be *minimal* if $d(F) \subseteq (x_1, \ldots, x_m)F$.

If the minimal free resolution of S/I is a resolution associated to $RC(L, \pi)$ for some rooting map π, then I (respectively S/I) is called a *rooted ideal* (respectively a *rooted ring*). Similarly, if the Lyubeznik resolution of S/I is minimal then I (respectively S/I) is called a *Lyubeznik ideal* (respectively a *Lyubeznik ring*).

Example 2.8. Let $S = k[x, y, z]$ and let I be the ideal generated by $m_1 = xy$, $m_2 = yz$ and $m_3 = xz$. Order the generators as $m_1 \prec m_2 \prec m_3$. Let π be the rooting map of the Lyubeznik resolution as in Definition 2.6. Then the rooted sets are m_1, m_2, m_3, m_1m_2 and m_1m_3. So the Lyubeznik resolution is

$$S^2 \xrightarrow{\quad d_2 \quad} S^3 \xrightarrow{\quad d_1 \quad} S$$

where the differential is given by

$$d_1 = \begin{bmatrix} xy & yz & xz \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$d_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -z & -z \\ x & 0 \\ 0 & y \end{bmatrix}.$$

In particular, the resolution is minimal and so I is a Lyubeznik ideal.

3 A_∞-algebras

In this section we will discuss some basic aspects of the theory of A_∞-algebras. The notion was first introduced by Stasheff [23] in the context of algebraic topology. Since their introduction A_∞-algebras have found applications in various branches of mathematics such as geometry [7], algebra [24] and mathematical physics [15], [19]. Though the following section aims to be self-contained, a more extensive introduction can be found in [14]. The exposition below follows that of [17].
In what follows all signs are determined by the *Koszul sign convention*

$$(f \otimes g)(x \otimes y) = (-1)^{|g|\cdot|x|} fx \otimes gy. \tag{1}$$

Definition 3.1. Let R be a commutative ring and $A = \oplus A_n$ a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded free R-module. An A_∞-algebra structure on A consists of a sequence of maps $\mu_n \colon A^{\otimes n} \to A$ of degree $n-2$ satisfying the *Stasheff identities*

$$\sum (-1)^{r+st} \mu_u (1^{\otimes r} \otimes \mu_s \otimes 1^{\otimes t}) = 0 \tag{2}$$

where the sum runs over all decompositions $n = r + s + t$ with $r, t \geq 0$, $s \geq 1$ and $u = r + t + 1$.

Observe that when applying (2) to an element additional signs appear because of the Koszul sign convention (1).

For small n, the Stasheff identities say the following. If $n = 1$, we obtain $\mu_1^2 = 0$, that is (A, μ_1) is a chain complex.
If $n = 2$, we get

$$\mu_1\mu_2 = \mu_2(\mu_1 \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \mu_1)$$

which means that μ_1 is a derivation with respect to μ_2.
If $n = 3$, we have

$$\mu_2(\mu_2 \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes \mu_2) = \mu_1\mu_3 + \mu_3(\mu_1 \otimes 1 \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \mu_1 \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes 1 \otimes \mu_1)$$

meaning that the multiplication μ_2 is associative up to the homotopy μ_3. In the special case when $\mu_3 = 0$, it follows that μ_2 is strictly associative and so A is a differential graded algebra with differential μ_1 and multiplication μ_2.

In the rest of the paper every A_∞-algebra A will be *strictly unital*, that is to say that A contains an element 1 such that

$$\mu_2(1 \otimes a) = a = \mu_2(a \otimes 1)$$

for all $a \in A$ and for all $n \geq 3$,

$$\mu_n(a_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_n) = 0$$

if $a_i = 1$ for some i.

The notion of a morphism between A_∞-algebras will also be needed.

Definition 3.2. Let (A, μ_n) and $(B, \overline{\mu}_n)$ be A_∞-algebras. A *morphism* of A_∞-algebras (or A_∞*-morphism*) $f\colon A \to B$ is a family of linear maps

$$f_n\colon A^{\otimes n} \to B$$

of degree $n-1$ satisfying the *Stasheff morphism identities*

$$\sum (-1)^{r+st} f_u(1^{\otimes r} \otimes \mu_s \otimes 1^{\otimes t}) = \sum (-1)^w \overline{\mu}_q(f_{i_1} \otimes f_{i_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes f_{i_q}) \quad (3)$$

for every $n \geq 1$. The first sum runs over all decompositions $n = r + s + t$ with $s \geq 1$ and $r, t \geq 0$ where $u = r + t + 1$. The second sum runs over all $1 \leq q \leq n$ and all decompositions $n = i_1 + i_2 + \cdots + i_q$ with all $i_s \geq 1$. The sign on the right-hand side of (3) is given by

$$w = \sum_{p=1}^{q-1} (q-p)(i_p - 1).$$

If A and B are strictly unital, an A_∞-morphism is also required to satisfy $f_1(1) = 1$ and

$$f_n(a_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_n) = 0$$

if $n \geq 2$ and $a_i = 1$ for some i.

To establish some terminology, we say that f is a *quasi-isomorphism* if f_1 is a quasi-isomorphism in the usual sense. A morphism f is *strict* if $f_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1$. The *identity morphism* is the strict morphism with f_1 being the identity. Lastly, a *strict isomorphism* is a strict morphism f with being f_1 an isomorphism.

Let A be an A_∞-algebra. Since μ_1 is a differential, we can consider the homology

$$HA = \ker \mu_1 / \operatorname{im} \mu_1$$

of the underlying chain complex (A, μ_1). The multiplication μ_2 on A induces a multiplication on HA making HA into an associative algebra. A crucial result relating the A_∞-algebra A and its homology algebra HA is the *homotopy transfer theorem*.

Theorem 3.3 (Homotopy Transfer Theorem, [11], see also [20])**.** Let (A, μ_n) be an A_∞-algebra and let HA be its homology algebra. There exists an A_∞-algebra structure μ'_n on HA such that

1. $\mu'_1 = 0$, $\mu'_2 = H(\mu_2)$ and the higher μ'_n are determined by μ_n
2. there exists an A_∞-quasi-isomorphism $HA \to A$ lifting the identity morphism of HA.

Moreover, this A_∞-structure is unique up to isomorphism of A_∞-algebras.

An explicit way of contructing A_∞-structures on the homology of a dga is due to Merkulov [20]. Let (A, d) be a dga and let B be a subcomplex of A. Assume that there exists an endomorphism $Q\colon A \to A$ of odd degree with the property that

$$(1 - [d, Q])(A) \subseteq B$$

where $[d, Q]$ denotes the graded commutator. Let $\cdot$ denote the product on A. Define linear maps

$$\lambda_n\colon A^{\otimes n} \to A$$

as follows. First, we put

$$\lambda_2(a_1, a_2) = a_1 \cdot a_2$$

and we set

$$\lambda_n(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = -\sum_{\substack{k+l=n \\ k,l\geq 1}} \epsilon(Q\lambda_k(a_1, \ldots, a_k)) \cdot (Q\lambda_l(a_{k+1}, \ldots, a_n)) \quad (4)$$

where

$$\epsilon = (-1)^{k+(l-1)(\tilde{a}_1+\cdots+\tilde{a}_k)}$$

and $\tilde{x} = 1$ if the degree of x is even and $\tilde{x} = -1$ otherwise. Now, define a second series of maps

$$\mu_n\colon B^{\otimes n} \to B$$

as follows. Set $\mu_1 = d$ and for $n \geq 2$, define

$$\mu_n = (1 - [d, Q])\lambda_n. \quad (5)$$

The following theorem will be crucial in the remainder of the paper.

Theorem 3.4 ([20], Theorem 3.4)**.** Let (A, d) be a dga and B a subcomplex of A. Let $Q\colon A \to A$ be an endomorphism of odd degree with the property that

$$(1 - [d, Q])(A) \subseteq B$$

where $[d, Q]$ denotes the graded commutator. Then the maps μ_n defined in (5) define the structure of an A_∞-algebra on B.

4 A_∞-resolutions and the Golod property

Given a monomial ring $R = S/I$, where $S = k[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$, the *Poincaré series* of R is defined as

$$P(R) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \dim \operatorname{Tor}_j^R(k, k)t^j.$$

The ring R is called *Golod* if there is an equality of power series

$$P(R) = \frac{(1+t)^m}{1 - t(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \dim \operatorname{Tor}_j^S(R, k)t^j - 1)} \quad (6)$$

In fact, it can be shown [2] that $P(R)$ is always bounded above by the right hand side of (6). So, a ring R is Golod if and only if the Poincaré series $P(R)$ of R is maximal.
The Golod property admits an equivalent description in terms of Massey products which will be defined next.

Definition 4.1. Let (A, d) be a differential graded algebra. If $a \in A$, we write $\bar{a}$ for $(-1)^{\deg(a)+1}a$.
Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in HA$. The length 2 *Massey product* $\langle \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \rangle$ is defined to be the product $\alpha_1\alpha_2$ in the homology algebra HA.
The length 3 *Massey product* $\langle \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \rangle$ is defined as follows. Suppose that $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in HA$ are homology classes represented by cycles a_{01}, a_{12}, a_{23} with the property that $\alpha_1\alpha_2 = 0 = \alpha_2\alpha_3$. Choose chains a_{02} and a_{13} such that $d(a_{02}) = \bar{a}_{01}a_{12}$ and $d(a_{13}) = \bar{a}_{12}a_{23}$. Then $\bar{a}_{02}a_{23} + \bar{a}_{01}a_{13}$ is a cycle and hence represents some homology class. Note that making different choices for a_{02} and a_{13} can produce different homology classes. The Massey triple product $\langle \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \rangle$ is defined to be the set of all possible resulting homology classes.
The length n *Massey product* $\langle \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \rangle$ is defined as follows. Suppose that $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ are homology classes such that for $i < j$ and $j - i < n - 1$ each length $j - i + 1$ Massey product $\langle \alpha_i, \ldots, \alpha_j \rangle$ is defined and contains zero. For all i and j such that $0 < i < j < n$ and $j-i+1 \leq n$ choose homology classes a_{ij} as follows. Let $a_{i-1,i}$ be a cycle representing the homology class α_i. For $j > i + 1$, let a_{ij} be a cycle such that $da_{ij} = \sum_{i<k<j} \bar{a}_{ik}a_{kj}$. The length n Massey product $\langle \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \rangle$ is then the set of all homology classes represented by cycles of the form $\sum_{0<i<n} \bar{a}_{0i}a_{in}$ for all possible choices of a_{ij}.

A Massey product $\langle \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \rangle$ is said to be *trivial* if it contains zero. The following theorem will be crucial in what follows. The *Koszul homology* of a monomial ring R is $H(R) = \mathrm{Tor}^S(R, k)$.

Theorem 4.2 ([8], see also Section 4.2 of [9])**.** For any monomial ring R the following are equivalent

1. Equality (6) holds, that is R is Golod.
2. All Massey products in the Koszul homology are trivial.

Following [13], we will say that a dga A satisfies *condition* (B_r) if all k-ary Massey products are defined and contain only zero for all $k \leq r$. Recall the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3 ([18], Proposition 2.3)**.** Let A be a dga satisfying (B_{r-1}). Then $\langle a_1, \ldots, a_r \rangle$ is defined and contains only one element for any choice $a_1, \ldots, a_r \in H(A)$.

We say that a monomial ring R satisfies (B_r) if the Koszul dga K_R of R satisfies (B_r).

Lemma 4.4. Let R be a monomial ring. Then R is Golod if and only if R satisfies condition (B_r) for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. It is clear that if R satisfies condition (B_r) for every r then R is Golod. Conversely, suppose that R is Golod. We proceed by induction on r. The case $r = 2$ is trivial. So assume R satisfies (B_{r-1}). By Lemma 4.3, the Massey product $\langle a_1, \ldots, a_r \rangle$ is defined and contains only one element for any choice $a_1, \ldots, a_r \in \mathrm{Tor}^S(R, k)$. Since R is Golod, it follows by Theorem 4.2 that this element must be zero and so R satisfies (B_r). □

In general it is very hard to study Massey products directly. However, A_∞-algebras provide a systematic way of studying Massey products in view of the following theorem.

Theorem 4.5 ([17], Theorem 3.1)**.** Let A be a differential graded algebra. Up to a sign, the higher A_∞-multiplications ν_n on HA from Theorem 3.3

give Massey products. That is to say, if $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in HA$ are homology classes such that the Massey product $\langle \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \rangle$ is defined then

$$\pm\nu_n(\alpha_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \alpha_n) \in \langle \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \rangle.$$

Using Theorem 4.5, we can describe under what conditions the Massey products on $\mathrm{Tor}^S(R,k)$ vanish.

Definition 4.6. Let $F \to R$ be a free resolution and let $\alpha\colon F^{\otimes n} \to F$ be S-linear. Then α is said to be *minimal* if $\alpha \otimes_S 1_k = 0$.

It is readily verified that μ_n is minimal if and only if μ_n maps into $(x_1, \ldots, x_m)F$. We have the following result.

Theorem 4.7. Let $R = S/I$ be a monomial ring with minimal free resolution F. Let μ_n be an A_∞-structure on F. Then R is Golod if and only if μ_n is minimal for all $n \geq 1$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.17 of [16], it follows that $\mu_n \otimes 1$ is an A_∞-structure on $F \otimes k$. Now, assume μ_n is minimal for all n. Since $\mathrm{Tor}^S(R,k)$ is the homology of the A_∞-algebra $F \otimes k$ the homotopy transfer theorem (Theorem 3.3) implies that $\mathrm{Tor}^S(R,k)$ inherits an A_∞-structure ν_n. Since F is minimal, $\mathrm{Tor}^S(R,k)$ is isomorphic to $F \otimes k$ and we can take $\nu_n = \mu_n \otimes 1$. Let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \mathrm{Tor}^S(R,k)$ be such that the Massey product $\langle \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \rangle$ is defined. By Theorem 4.5 we have

$$\pm(\mu_n \otimes 1)(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in \langle \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \rangle.$$

Since μ_n is minimal, we have $(\mu_n \otimes 1)(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) = 0$. Therefore, $\langle \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \rangle$ is trivial and so R is Golod.
Conversely, assume that R is Golod. We need to show that μ_n is minimal for all n. For $n = 2$, we have $(\mu_2 \otimes 1)(a_1, a_2) = a_1 a_2$ but the product on $\mathrm{Tor}^S(R,k)$ is zero as R is Golod. Now, let $n \geq 3$. Since R is Golod, R satisfies (B_n) and thus for all $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ the Massey product $\langle a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle$ is defined and contains only zero. Since $(\mu_n \otimes 1)(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \langle a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle$ we have $(\mu_n \otimes 1)(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = 0$ for all $a_1, \ldots, a_n$. Consequently, μ_n is minimal as required. □

Theorem 4.7 was first proved in [6] using different methods. Observe that the proof of Theorem 4.7 in fact shows the following.

Corollary 4.8. Let $R = S/I$ be a monomial ring with minimal free resolution F. Let μ_n be an A_∞-structure on F and let $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Then R satisfies (B_r) if and only if μ_k is minimal for all $k \leq r$.

An immediate consequence of Theorem 4.7 is the following.

Corollary 4.9. Let $R = S/I$ be a monomial ring with minimal free resolution F. If F admits the structure of a dga, then R is Golod if and only if the product on $\mathrm{Tor}^S(R,k)$ vanishes.

As a special case of Corollary 4.9, we consider monomial rings R for which the Taylor resolution is minimal. The following lemma is a straightforward generalization of Lemma 4.14 of [3].

Lemma 4.10. Let $I = (m_1, \ldots, m_r)$ be a monomial ideal. Then the Taylor resolution of S/I is minimal if and only if m_i is not a divisor of m_J for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ and $J \subseteq \{1, \ldots, r\} \setminus i$.

Theorem 4.11. Let $R = S/I$ be a monomial ring and suppose that the Taylor resolution T of R is minimal. Then the following are equivalent.

1. The ring R is Golod.
2. For all m_i and m_j with $\gcd(m_i, m_j) = 1$ there exists an $m_k \neq m_i, m_j$ such that m_k divides $\operatorname{lcm}(m_i, m_j)$.

Proof. By Corollary 4.9 it is sufficient to show that the second statement is equivalent to the vanishing of the product on $\operatorname{Tor}^S(R, k)$. First, suppose that 2. holds. By minimality of T, we have $\operatorname{Tor}^S(R, k) \cong T \otimes_S k$. Now, assume that the product on $\operatorname{Tor}^S(R, k)$ is not trivial. Then there exist $u_I, u_J \in T$ such that

$$u_I u_J = \operatorname{sgn}(I, J)\frac{m_I m_J}{m_{I\cup J}} u_{I\cup J} \notin (x_1, \ldots, x_m)T.$$

Hence, we have

$$\frac{m_I m_J}{m_{I\cup J}} u_{I\cup J} = 1.$$

It follows that $\gcd(m_I, m_J) = 1$. Now, fix some $i \in I$ and $j \in J$. Then, in particular, $\gcd(m_i, m_j) = 1$ and so there is some $m_k \neq m_i, m_j$ such that m_k divides $\operatorname{lcm}(m_i, m_j)$. But this contradicts T being minimal by Lemma 4.10.
Conversely, assume that the product on $\operatorname{Tor}^S(R, k)$ is trivial and fix m_i and m_j. Since $u_i u_j = 0$, a similar argument to the above shows that $m_i m_j \neq \operatorname{lcm}(m_i, m_j)$. But then $\gcd(m_i, m_j) \neq 1$ for all i and j and so we are done. □

Note that the proof in fact shows the following stronger statement.

Corollary 4.12. Let $R = S/I$ be a monomial ring. Suppose that the Taylor resolution is minimal. If R is Golod then $\gcd(m_i, m_j) \neq 1$ for all $i, j = 1, \ldots, r$.

This corollary shows that the class of monomial rings which are Golod and have minimal Taylor resolution is quite small and provides a motivation for considering monomial rings with rooted minimal free resolution.

5 SDRs of the Taylor resolution

Theorem 4.7 implies that monomial rings with minimal dga resolution are Golod if and only the product on $\operatorname{Tor}^S(S/I, k)$ vanishes. However, there exists monomial rings whose minimal resolution does not admit the structure of a dga. The following example is due to Avramov [1].

Example 5.1 ([1], Example 1)**.** Let $S = k[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]$ and

$$I = (x_1^2, x_1x_2, x_2x_3, x_3x_4, x_4^2).$$

Then the minimal free resolution of S/I does not admit the structure of a dga.

On the other hand, every free resolution of a monomial ring S/I admits an A_∞-structure [6]. In general. it is not clear how to obtain an explicit description of this A_∞-structure. Instead of considering general A_∞-structures on resolutions, we will consider only those that arise as a deformation of the dga structure on the Taylor resolution. To make this idea precise we will need the notion of a strong deformation retract of the Taylor resolution. In that case Corollary 5.3 tells us how to construct an A_∞-structure to which we may apply Theorem 4.7.

We recall the following definition.

Definition 5.2. Let (A, d) be a chain complex and let $B \subseteq A$ be a subcomplex. Then



is a *strong deformation retract* if

1. $pi = 1_B$,
2. $ip = 1_A - [d, \phi]$,

where $[d, \phi] = d\phi + \phi d$.

Note that ϕ is of degree one. Since $1_A - [d, \phi] = ip$, it follows that $1_A - [d, \phi]$ maps into B. In particular, Theorem 3.4 applies and we record the following for future reference.

Corollary 5.3. Let



be a strong deformation retract. Then the maps μ_n from Theorem 3.4 with $Q = \phi$ give the structure of an A_∞-algebra on B.

The following lemma relates μ_2 to the product on $\operatorname{Tor}^S(S/I, k)$.

Lemma 5.4. Let S/I be rooted with minimal free resolution $F \to S/I$ and let μ_n be the A_∞-algebra structure on F from Corollary 5.3. Then the map $\mu_2 \colon F \otimes F \to F$ induces the product on $\operatorname{Tor}^S(S/I, k)$.

Proof. Consider the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F \otimes F & \xrightarrow{\mu_2} & F \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle i \otimes i} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle i} \\ T \otimes T & \xrightarrow[\lambda_2]{} & T \end{array}$$

where T is the Taylor resolution. Since $\mu_2 = p \circ \lambda_2 \circ (i \otimes i)$, it follows that

$$i \circ \mu_2 = i \circ p \circ \lambda_2 \circ (i \otimes i) \simeq \lambda_2 \circ (i \otimes i).$$

Hence the above square is homotopy commutative. Consequently, by tensoring with the field k and taking homology we get a commutative square as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{Tor}^S(S/I, k)^{\otimes 2} & \xrightarrow{(\mu_2)_*} & \operatorname{Tor}^S(S/I, k) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle i_* \otimes i_*} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle i_*} \\ \operatorname{Tor}^S(S/I, k)^{\otimes 2} & \xrightarrow[(\lambda_2)_*]{} & \operatorname{Tor}^S(S/I, k). \end{array}$$

Since $i_* = 1$, we have $p_* = (i_*)^{-1} = 1$. Therefore, $(\mu_2)_* = (\lambda_2)_*$. Since λ_2 induces the product, the same holds for μ_2. □

Now, let π be a rooting map and let F be the free resolution of S/I associated to $RC(L,\pi)$. Recall that F_n is the free S-module on u_J with $|J| = n$. The remainder of this section is devoted to computing an explicit A_∞-algebra structure on F. Let T will denote the Taylor resolution of S/I. We will write d for the differential of F whereas ∂ will be reserved for the "simplicial" differential, i.e.

$$\partial u_J = \sum_{i=1}^{|J|} (-1)^{i+1} u_{J^i}$$

on a basis set u_J of F. If u_J is a basis set of F we define (formally) $[u_J] = \frac{1}{m_J} u_J$. Let $u_{J_1}, \ldots, u_{J_n}$ be rooted sets and $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in S$. Then for $u = \sum \alpha_k u_{J_k}$, we set $[u] = \sum \frac{\alpha_k}{m_{J_k}} u_{J_k}$. The following lemma will be used extensively.

Lemma 5.5. For any basis set u_J of F we have

$$d[u_J] = [\partial u_J].$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} d[u_J] &= \frac{1}{m_J} d u_J \\ &= \frac{1}{m_J} \sum_{i=1}^{|J|} (-1)^{i+1} \frac{m_J}{m_{J^i}} u_{J^i} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{|J|} (-1)^{i+1} \frac{1}{m_{J^i}} u_{J^i} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{|J|} (-1)^{i+1} [u_{J^i}] \\ &= [\partial u_J]. \end{aligned}$$

□

Let π be a rooting map. For $u_J \in T$, define $\pi(u_J) = u_i$ if $\pi(m_J) = m_i$. Define a map $p' \colon T \to F$ as follows. Let $u \in T$ and write $u = u_{i_1} \cdots u_{i_k}$. For $q = 1, \ldots, k$ define $I_q = \{i_1, \ldots, i_q\}$. For a permutation $\sigma \in S_k$, put $u_{\sigma I_q} = u_{i_{\sigma(1)}} \cdots u_{i_{\sigma(q)}}$. We define

$$p'(u) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \pi(u_{\sigma I_1}) \pi(u_{\sigma I_2}) \cdots \pi(u_{\sigma I_k}). \tag{7}$$

It is readily verified that p' is a chain map with respect to ∂. Now, let $i \colon F \to T$ denote the inclusion.

Lemma 5.6. For all $u \in T$, we have

$$\pi(u) i p' \partial u = i p' u.$$

Proof. It is sufficient to prove the result for basis elements $u_I \in T$. Write $I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$. We first show that

$$\partial p'(u_I) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} (-1)^{k+1} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \pi(u_{\sigma I_1}) \cdots \pi(u_{\sigma I_{k-1}}).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial p'(u_I) &= \sum_{\sigma\in S_k} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma)\partial\big(\pi(u_{\sigma I_1})\cdots\pi(u_{\sigma I_k})\big)\\ &= \sum_{\sigma\in S_k}\sum_{j=1}^{k}(-1)^{j+1}\operatorname{sgn}(\sigma)\pi(u_{\sigma I_1})\cdots\widehat{\pi(u_{\sigma I_j})}\cdots\pi(u_{\sigma I_k}).\end{aligned}$$

Now, fix some j and put $\tau_j = (\sigma(j), \sigma(j+1))$. Then the summands indexed by σ and τ_j cancel. Indeed, if $q \le j$ then $u_{\sigma I_q} = u_{\tau_j\sigma I_q}$. On the other hand, if $q > j+1$ then

$$u_{\sigma I_q} = u_{i_{\sigma(1)}}\cdots u_{i_{\sigma(j)}}u_{i_{\sigma(j+1)}}\cdots u_{i_{\sigma(q)}}$$

and

$$u_{\tau_j\sigma I_q} = u_{i_{\sigma(1)}}\cdots u_{i_{\sigma(j+1)}}u_{i_{\sigma(j)}}\cdots u_{i_{\sigma(q)}}.$$

Since $\pi(u_J)$ depends only on the set J and not on the ordering we have

$$\pi(u_{\sigma I_q}) = \pi(u_{\tau_j\sigma I_q})$$

and so the summands indexed by σ and τ_j cancel. Therefore, we obtain

$$\partial p'(u_I) = \sum_{\sigma\in S_k}(-1)^{k+1}\operatorname{sgn}(\sigma)\pi(u_{\sigma I_1})\cdots\pi(u_{\sigma I_{k-1}}).$$

Now, compute

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(u_I)ip'\partial u_I &= \pi(u_I)\partial ip'(u_I)\\ &= \pi(u_I)\sum_{\sigma\in S_k}\operatorname{sgn}(\sigma)\partial\big(\pi(u_{\sigma I_1})\cdots\pi(u_{\sigma I_k})\big)\\ &= \pi(u_I)\sum_{\sigma\in S_k}(-1)^{k+1}\operatorname{sgn}(\sigma)\pi(u_{\sigma I_1})\cdots\pi(u_{\sigma I_{k-1}})\\ &= \sum_{\sigma\in S_k}(-1)^{k+1+k-1}\operatorname{sgn}(\sigma)\pi(u_{\sigma I_1})\cdots\pi(u_{\sigma I_{k-1}})\pi(u_I)\\ &= \sum_{\sigma\in S_k}\operatorname{sgn}(\sigma)\pi(u_{\sigma I_1})\cdots\pi(u_{\sigma I_{k-1}})\pi(u_\sigma I_k)\\ &= ip'(u_I)\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\pi(u_I) = \pi(u_{I_k}) = \pi(u_{\sigma I_k})$. □

Lemma 5.7. The composition ip' is chain homotopic to 1_T as chain maps $(T,\partial)\to(T,\partial)$.

Proof. Define $\phi' : T \to T$ by induction as follows. Set $\phi'_0 = \phi'_1 = 0$ and

$$\phi'_2(u_{i_1}u_{i_2}) = \pi(u_{i_1}, u_{i_2})u_{i_1}u_{i_2}.$$

For $k > 2$, write $u = u_{i_1}\cdots u_{i_k}$ and define

$$\phi'_k(u) = \pi(u)\big(u - \phi'_{k-1}(\partial u)\big).$$

We need to show that $1_T - ip' = \partial\phi' + \phi'\partial$. We proceed by induction on k. If $k = 1$, there is nothing to prove. If $k = 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial\phi_2(u_{i_1}u_{i_2}) &= \partial(\pi(u_{i_1}, u_{i_2})u_{i_1}u_{i_2})\\ &= u_{i_1}u_{i_2} - \pi(u_{i_1}, u_{i_2})u_{i_2} + \pi(u_{i_1}, u_{i_2})u_{i_1}\\ &= (1_F - ip')(u_{i_1}u_{i_2}).\end{aligned}$$

Now, let $k > 2$. Using Lemma 5.6, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\partial\phi'_k(u) &= u - \phi'_{k-1}\partial u - \pi(u)(\partial u - \partial\phi'_{k-1}\partial u)\\ &= u - \phi'_{k-1}\partial u - \pi(u)\big(\partial u - \partial u + ip'\partial u + \phi_{k-2}\partial^2 u\big)\\ &= u - \phi_{k-1}\partial u - \pi(u)ip'\partial u\\ &= u - ip'u - \phi_{k-1}\partial u\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. □

Define a map $p\colon T \to F$ as follows. For $u_J \in T$, define

$$p(u_J) = m_J[p'(u_J)] \tag{8}$$

where p' is the map from (7). Then we have the following theorem.

Theorem 5.8. Let π be a rooting map for a monomial ideal I and let F be the resolution of S/I associated to π. Then there exists a strong deformation retract

$$F \underset{p}{\overset{i}{\rightleftarrows}} T \circlearrowright \phi$$

where $i\colon F \to T$ is the inclusion and $p\colon T \to F$ is the map from (8).

Proof. Let $u_J \in T$ and define a map ϕ by

$$\phi(u_J) = m_J[\phi'(u_J)].$$

Then, using Lemma 5.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned}d\phi(u_J) &= m_J d[\phi'(u_J)]\\ &= m_J[\partial\phi'(u_J)]\\ &= m_J[u_J - ip'u_J - \phi'\partial u_J]\\ &= u_J - ipu_J - \phi du_J\end{aligned}$$

and so 1_T and ip are homotopic. On the other hand, we clearly have $pi = 1_F$ which finishes the proof. □

6 The Golod property for rooted rings

Let $R = S/I$ be a rooted ring with rooting map π and minimal free resolution F. The purpose of this section is to provide necessary and sufficient conditions for R being Golod. We start with the following definition.

Definition 6.1. Let $R = S/I$ be a rooted ring with rooting map π. Write $I = (m_1, \dots, m_r)$. We say that R is π-*gcd* if $\pi(m_i, m_j) \neq m_i, m_j$ whenever $\gcd(m_i, m_j) = 1$.

The following lemma is straightforward but included for completeness.

Lemma 6.2. Let u_I and u_J be basis elements of F with the property that $\gcd(m_I, m_J) \neq 1$. Then

$$p\lambda_2(u_I, u_J) \in (x_1, \dots, x_m)F.$$

Proof. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p\lambda_2(u_I \otimes u_j) &= p(\frac{m_I m_J}{m_{I\cup J}} u_{I\cup J}) \\ &= \frac{m_I m_J}{m_{I\cup J}} p(u_{I\cup J}). \end{aligned}$$

By assumption

$$\frac{m_I m_J}{m_{I\cup J}} \neq 1$$

and so

$$p\lambda_2(u_I \otimes u_J) = \frac{m_I m_J}{m_{I\cup J}} p(u_{I\cup J}) \in (x_1, \ldots, x_m)F.$$

□

Lemma 6.3. Let R be a rooted ring with rooting map π. If R is π-gcd then R is Golod

Proof. Let F be the minimal free resolution of R. Then by Theorem 5.8 there is a strong deformation retract



where $i\colon F \to T$ is the inclusion and $p\colon T \to F$ is the map from (8). By Corollary 5.3, we obtain an A_∞-structure μ_n on F. From Theorem 4.7 it follows that it is sufficient to show that each μ_n is minimal. Recall that $\mu_n = p\lambda_n$ where

$$\lambda_n(v_1, \ldots, v_n) = -\sum_{\substack{k+l=n \\ k,l\geq 1}} \epsilon\lambda_2((Q\lambda_k(v_1, \ldots, v_k)) \otimes (Q\lambda_l(v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_n))).$$

Therefore, it is sufficient to prove that $p\lambda_2$ maps into the maximal ideal. Let u_I and u_J be basis elements of F. We may assume that $\gcd(m_I, m_J) = 1$ since otherwise $p\lambda_2(u_I \otimes u_J) \in (x_1, \ldots, x_m)F$ by lemma 6.2. Write $I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$ and $J = \{i_{k+1}, \ldots, i_n\}$ where $n = k + l$. By definition of p we have

$$p(u_{i_1} \cdots u_{i_n}) = m[\sum_{\sigma\in S_n} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma)\pi(u_{\sigma I_1}) \cdots \pi(u_{\sigma I_n})]$$

where $m = \operatorname{lcm}(m_I, m_J) = m_I m_J$ and

$$u_{\sigma I_P} = u_{i_{\sigma(1)}} \cdots u_{i_{\sigma(p)}}.$$

Write

$$\alpha_\sigma = \frac{m}{\operatorname{lcm}(\pi(m_{\sigma I_1}), \ldots, \pi(m_{\sigma I_n}))}$$

then

$$p(u_{i_1} \cdots u_{i_n}) = \sum_{\sigma\in S_n} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma)\alpha_\sigma\pi(u_{\sigma I_1}) \cdots \pi(u_{\sigma I_n}).$$

We need to show that $\alpha_\sigma \in (x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ for all $\sigma \in S_n$. Suppose $\alpha_\sigma = 1$ for some $\sigma \in S_n$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $i_{\sigma(1)} \in I$. Set

$$q = \min\{q' | i_{\sigma(q')} \in J\}.$$

By assumption, $\operatorname{lcm}(\pi(m_{\sigma I_1}), \ldots, \pi(m_{\sigma I_n}))$ is divisible by $m_{i_{\sigma(q)}}$. Since $\gcd(m_{i_{\sigma(q)}}, m_I) = 1$, we have $\gcd(m_{i_{\sigma(q)}}, \pi(m_{\sigma I_k})) = 1$ for all $k < q$.

Therefore, $\operatorname{lcm}(\pi(m_{\sigma I_q}), \ldots, \pi(m_{\sigma I_n}))$ is still divisible by $m_{i_{\sigma(q)}}$. We claim that

$$m_{i_{\sigma(q)}} \notin \{\pi(m_{\sigma I_q}), \ldots, \pi(m_{\sigma I_n})\}.$$

Indeed, assume that $m_{i_{\sigma(q)}} = \pi(m_{\sigma I_s})$ for some $s \geq q$. We have that $\pi(m_{\sigma I_s}) = \pi(m_{i_{\sigma(1)}}, \ldots, m_{i_{\sigma(s)}})$. Then

$$m_{i_{\sigma(q)}} | \operatorname{lcm}(m_{i_{\sigma(1)}}, m_{i_{\sigma(q)}}) | \operatorname{lcm}(m_{i_{\sigma(1)}}, \ldots, m_{i_{\sigma(s)}})$$

and so $m_{i_{\sigma(q)}} = \pi(m_{i_{\sigma(1)}}, m_{i_{\sigma(q)}})$ since π is a rooting map. But by definition of q we have $\gcd(m_{i_{\sigma(1)}}, m_{i_{\sigma(q)}}) = 1$ so this contradicts I being π-gcd. Therefore

$$m_{i_{\sigma(q)}} \notin \{\pi(u_{\sigma I_q}), \ldots, \pi(u_{\sigma I_n})\}.$$

Define

$$u = u_{i_{\sigma(q)}} \pi(m_{\sigma I_q}) \cdots \pi(m_{\sigma I_n})$$

then u is easily seen to be in F. But $du \notin (x_1, \ldots, x_m)F$ since $m_{i_{\sigma(q)}}$ divides $\operatorname{lcm}(\pi(m_{\sigma I_q}), \ldots, \pi(m_{\sigma I_n}))$ which contradicts minimality of F. □

We now come to the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 6.4. Let R be a rooted ring with rooting map π. Then the following are equivalent.

1. The ring R is Golod.
2. The product on $\operatorname{Tor}^S(R, k)$ vanishes.
3. The ring R is π-gcd.

Proof. The implication $1 \Rightarrow 2$ is immediate from the definition and $3 \Rightarrow 1$ follows by Lemma 6.3. We prove $2 \Rightarrow 3$. Since the product on $\operatorname{Tor}^S(R, k)$ is just $\mu_2 \otimes 1$, the product vanishes if and only if μ_2 is minimal. Let m_i and m_j be generators such that $\gcd(m_i, m_j) = 1$. Then

$$\mu_2(u_i, u_j) = \frac{\operatorname{lcm}(m_i, m_j)}{\operatorname{lcm}(\pi(m_i, m_j)m_i} \pi(u_i, u_j)u_i - \frac{\operatorname{lcm}(m_i, m_j)}{\operatorname{lcm}(\pi(m_i, m_j)m_j} \pi(u_i, u_j)u_j.$$

If $\pi(m_i, m_j) = m_j$ then

$$\frac{\operatorname{lcm}(m_i, m_j)}{\operatorname{lcm}(\pi(m_i, m_j)m_j} = 1$$

which contradicts minimality of μ_2 and so $\pi(m_i, m_j) \neq m_j$. Similarly, $\pi(m_i, m_j) \neq m_i$ and thus R is π-gcd. □

Corollary 6.5. Let R be a rooted ring and k' any field. Define $R' = R \otimes_k k'$. Then R is Golod if and only if R' is Golod.

Proof. Indeed, being rooted and being π-gcd are both independent of the base field. □

Remark 6.6. Corollary 6.5 is somewhat surprising since in general the property of being Golod is highly dependent on the base field [13].

As a special case, we consider rings for which the Lyubeznik resolution is minimal. Let $I = (m_1, \ldots, m_r)$ be a monomial ideal and pick some total order $\prec$ on the m_i. After relabelling we may assume that $m_1 \prec m_2 \prec \cdots \prec m_r$. Recall from Definition 2.6 that the Lyubeznik resolution is the rooted resolution with rooting map

$$\pi(S) = \min_{\prec}\{m_i \mid m_i \text{ divides } \operatorname{lcm}(S)\}.$$

To characterize Golodness for rings for which the Lyubeznik resolution is minimal the following definition is needed.

Definition 6.7. Let $I = (m_1, \ldots, m_r)$ be a Lyubeznik ideal with respect to the ordering

$$m_1 \prec m_2 \prec \cdots \prec m_r.$$

Then I is said to satisfy the *gcd condition* if for all generators m_i and m_j with $\gcd(m_i, m_j) = 1$ there exists a $m_k \prec m_i, m_j$ such that m_k divides $\operatorname{lcm}(m_i, m_j)$.

Remark 6.8. Note that the gcd condition as defined above is different from the gcd condition in [5].

Lemma 6.9. Let I be a Lyubeznik ideal. Then I is π-gcd if and only if I is gcd.

Proof. Let m_i and m_j be generators of I such that $\gcd(m_i, m_j) = 1$. First, suppose that I is π-gcd. Set $m_k = \pi(m_i, m_j)$. Since I is π-gcd, $m_k \neq m_i, m_j$. So, by definition of π, $m_k \prec m_i, m_j$ and m_k divides $\operatorname{lcm}(m_i, m_j)$. Therefore, I is gcd.
Conversely, if I is gcd then there exists some $m_k \prec m_i, m_j$ such that m_k divides $\operatorname{lcm}(m_i, m_j)$. But by definition of π, $\pi(m_i, m_j)$ is the smallest such m_k. Hence, $\pi(m_i, m_j) \preceq m_k \prec m_i, m_j$ and so I is π-gcd. □

Therefore, we immediately have the following consequence of Theorem 6.4.

Corollary 6.10. Let R be a Lyubeznik ring. Then the following are equivalent.

1. The ring R is Golod.
2. The product on $\operatorname{Tor}^S(R, k)$ vanishes.
3. The ring R is gcd.

Example 6.11. Let $S = k[x_1, \ldots, x_9]$ and let I be the ideal

$$(x_2x_5x_8, x_2x_3x_8x_9, x_5x_6x_7x_8, x_1x_2x_4x_5, x_1x_2x_3, x_4x_5x_6, x_7x_8x_9).$$

Label the generators by $u_1, \ldots, u_9$ and order them by $u_1 \prec u_2 \prec \cdots \prec u_9$. Let L be the Lyubeznik resolution with respect to the ordering $\prec$. Then L is easily seen to be minimal. Plainly, I satisfies the gcd condition and so S/I is Golod.

References

[1] L. Avramov. Obstructions to the existence of multiplicative structures on minimal free resolutions. *Amer. J. Math.*, 103(1):1–31, 1981.

[2] L. Avramov. Infinite free resolutions. In *Six lectures on commutative algebra*, Mod. Birkhäuser Class., pages 1–118. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2010.

[3] A. Ayzenberg. Buchstaber numbers and classical invariants of simplicial complexes. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2014.

[4] D. Bayer, I. Peeva, and B. Sturmfels. Monomial resolutions. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 5(1-2):31–46, 1998.

[5] A. Berglund and M. Jöllenbeck. On the Golod property of Stanley-Reisner rings. *J. Algebra*, 315(1):249–273, 2007.

[6] J. Burke. Higher homotopies and Golod rings. *ArXiv e-prints*, August 2015.

[7] E. Getzler and J. Jones. A_∞-algebras and the cyclic bar complex. *Illinois J. Math.*, 34(2):256–283, 1990.

[8] E. Golod. Homology of some local rings. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 33(5(203)):177–178, 1978.

[9] T. Gulliksen and G. Levin. *Homology of local rings*. Queen's Paper in Pure and Applied Mathematics, No. 20. Queen's University, Kingston, Ont., 1969.

[10] M. Jöllenbeck. On the multigraded Hilbert and Poincaré-Betti series and the Golod property of monomial rings. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 207(2):261–298, 2006.

[11] T. Kadeišvili. On the theory of homology of fiber spaces. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 35(3(213)):183–188, 1980. International Topology Conference (Moscow State Univ., Moscow, 1979).

[12] L. Katthän. A non-Golod ring with a trivial product on its Koszul homology. *ArXiv e-prints*, November 2015.

[13] L. Katthän. The Golod property for Stanley–Reisner rings in varying characteristic. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 220(6):2265–2276, 2016.

[14] B. Keller. Introduction to A-infinity algebras and modules. *Homology Homotopy Appl.*, 3(1):1–35, 2001.

[15] M. Kontsevich. Homological algebra of mirror symmetry. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 1, 2 (Zürich, 1994)*, pages 120–139. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995.

[16] J.-L Loday. The diagonal of the Stasheff polytope. In *Higher structures in geometry and physics*, volume 287 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 269–292. Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2011.

[17] D.-M. Lu, J. Palmieri, Q.-S. Wu, and J. Zhang. A-infinity structure on Ext-algebras. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 213(11):2017–2037, 2009.

[18] J. May. Matric Massey products. *J. Algebra*, 12:533–568, 1969.

[19] J. McCleary, editor. *Higher homotopy structures in topology and mathematical physics*, volume 227 of *Contemporary Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.

[20] S. Merkulov. Strong homotopy algebras of a Kähler manifold. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (3):153–164, 1999.

[21] J. Mermin. Three simplicial resolutions. In *Progress in commutative algebra 1*, pages 127–141. de Gruyter, Berlin, 2012.

[22] I. Novik. Lyubeznik's resolution and rooted complexes. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 16(1):97–101, 2002.

[23] J. Stasheff. Homotopy associativity of H-spaces. I, II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 108 (1963), 275-292; ibid.*, 108:293–312, 1963.

[24] J. Stasheff. Differential graded Lie algebras, quasi-Hopf algebras and higher homotopy algebras. In *Quantum groups (Leningrad, 1990)*, volume 1510 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 120–137. Springer, Berlin, 1992.

[25] D. Taylor. *Ideals generated by monomials in an R-sequence*. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Chicago, 1966.

R. Frankhuizen, School of Mathematics, University of Southampton, Southampton SO17 1BJ, UK

E-mail address: rf3e13@soton.ac.uk